

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

-oo-

In Re:) Case No. 19-30088
PG&E CORPORATION AND PACIFIC) Chapter 11
GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY)
Reorganized Debtors.) San Francisco, California
) Tuesday, March 29, 2022
) 10:00 AM
)
REORGANIZED DEBTORS' SEVENTY-
SIXTH OMNIBUS OBJECTION TO
CLAIMS (NO LIABILITY /
PASSTHROUGH CLAIMS)
FILED BY PG&E CORPORATION
[10537]

CREDITOR TODD GREENBERG'S
MOTION TO AMEND CLAIMS
NUMBERED 77335 AND 76018
FILED BY TODD
GREENBERG [11992]

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE HONORABLE DENNIS MONTALI
UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY JUDGE

APPEARANCES (All present by video or telephone):
For the Reorganized JENNIFER L. DODGE, ESQ.
Debtors: Law Offices of Jennifer L. Dodge
Inc.
2512 Artesia Boulevard
Suite 300D
Redondo Beach, CA 90278
(310) 372-3344

THOMAS B. RUPP, ESQ.
Keller Benvenutti Kim LLP
650 California Street
Suite 1900
San Francisco, CA 94108
(415) 636-9015

1 For Todd Greenberg: RICHARD A. LAPPING, ESQ.
2 Trodella & Lapping LLP
3 540 Pacific Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94133
(415) 399-1015

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Court Recorder: LORENA PARADA/ANKEY THOMAS
United States Bankruptcy Court
450 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102

Transcriber: RIVER WOLFE
eScribers, LLC
7227 N. 16th Street
Suite #207
Phoenix, AZ 85020
(973) 406-2250

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording;
transcript provided by transcription service.

PG&E Corporation and Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA, TUESDAY, MARCH 29, 2022, 10:00 AM

2 -00o-

3 (Call to order of the Court.)

4 THE CLERK: Court is now in session, the Honorable
5 Dennis Montali presiding. Calling the matter PG&E Corporation.

6 I'll bring counsel in now, Your Honor.

7 THE COURT: Okay. Okay. Good morning, Ms. Dodge, and
8 then Mr. Rupp. You may make your appearances, please.

9 MS. DODGE: Good morning, Your Honor. Jennifer Dodge
10 on behalf of the reorganized debtors.

11 MR. RUPP: Good morning, Your Honor. Thomas Rupp of
12 Keller Benvenutti Kim on behalf of the reorganized debtors.

13 THE COURT: And Mr. Lapping.

14 MR. LAPPING: Good morning, Your Honor. Richard
15 Lapping appearing on behalf of creditor Todd Greenberg.

16 THE COURT: So Mr. Rupp and Ms. Dodge, are you going
17 to divide your time? I mean, I didn't do a time allocation,
18 but what's your desire here?

19 MS. DODGE: Your Honor, I will take the lead to the
20 extent that you would like to hear oral argument on this issue.

21 THE COURT: Okay. Well, and that's what I
22 anticipated, but Mr. Rupp indicated that he was going to
23 appear. I didn't do a time allocation. This is a very
24 discreet issue.

25 So Mr. Lapping, I'm going to let you make the first

PG&E Corporation and Pacific Gas and Electric Company
1 argument, and I'm not going to -- I'm not going to turn the
2 clock on yet. Just be reasonable.

3 But here's my question. Leaving aside the differences
4 of opinion about redline and Word and WordPerfect or whatever
5 form, these events occurred six years ago. And I understand
6 Mr. Greenberg was representing himself early, but you've been
7 in his counsel for a long time.

8 Why did it take five and a half years or whatever to
9 add this -- both claims seem to be -- the biggest addition is
10 the lost rent. Lost rent is lost rent. Why was it something
11 that came up only in the context of this motion?

12 MR. LAPPING: Well, Your Honor, I haven't been
13 involved since 2016.

14 THE COURT: I know. I know. I'm acknowledging that.

15 MR. LAPPING: Okay.

16 THE COURT: But you have been involved for a while.

17 MR. LAPPING: Right. But the lost rent, I think, was
18 a component of the original claim. I'm looking at the claim
19 for the property damage, and there is an item for lost rent.
20 And the whole purpose of the amendment, from our point of view,
21 is to basically describe the claim with greater particularity,
22 as set forth originally in the Sambo's Restaurants case.

23 And so we're updating it. And these claims are kind
24 of befuddled, if you will.

25 THE COURT: No, no. Just wait. Wait. Slow down.

PG&E Corporation and Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 You're going too fast. You're talking about -- let's start
2 with 77335. That's the electrical interruption, right?

3 MR. LAPPING: Yes.

4 THE COURT: Okay. So where is the lost rent in the
5 original claim? And the current motion, if I read it
6 correctly, adds an 86,400-dollar item, which it looked to me
7 like a new claim -- not a new -- maybe not a new theory of
8 entitlement, but certainly a near measure of damage.

9 So I looked at -- I looked at the original one and
10 maybe -- oh, there it -- I beg your pardon. Now I see it.
11 It's in a different section. Oh. Lost rent while waiting for
12 completion, 39,000. So it's gone from 39 to 86,000.

13 Well, what's so magic? Why was it necessary to -- and
14 why wasn't it in there to begin with?

15 MR. LAPPING: Your Honor, I think we -- I sat with the
16 client, and we looked at the claim. And my reaction was, it
17 needed to be clarified. And he has a claim for the fact that
18 he couldn't rent the upper or lower unit -- I forget which --
19 during the period of time when it should have been under
20 repair.

21 And as I sit here now, we came up with a calculation
22 for it. But the concept was there, and the passage of time, it
23 had just increased -- our view of it is the proof will show
24 that there's twenty-four months of lost rent, and that pencils
25 out to 86,000 dollars.

PG&E Corporation and Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 THE COURT: Okay. So let's now switch to the other
2 claim, the claim for the damaged gas lines. In that case there
3 is a -- the new claim has the lost rent -- just a minute. Hold
4 on. My phone is ringing. I don't want to kill this phone
5 here.

6 That damaged gas line, claim number 76018, it looks
7 like an additional 165,000 dollars. I don't recall what the
8 original amount was. Maybe you do, but I just --

9 MR. LAPPING: Your Honor, there's an exhibit to the
10 original proof of claim, and it's a summary of the damages.
11 And one of the items, again, is lost rent, waiting for
12 completion of construction, for thirteen months. And on my
13 advice, I think, yeah, an additional nine months.

14 So what do we have in the current one?

15 THE COURT: Well, the current one, I see -- because of
16 the voluminous paperwork, I just looked at a summary of the
17 claim, and the claim went up by -- if I grant your motion, the
18 claim is going up by, I think, a substantial sum. And there
19 may be a couple of smaller components, but the lost rent seemed
20 to be the biggest one.

21 Okay. Listen, you've answered my question. Go ahead
22 and make whatever argument you wish to make. And I do have the
23 background.

24 MR. LAPPING: Well, yes, Your Honor. I mean, I think
25 the idea is that I wanted to -- I wanted to get the claims

PG&E Corporation and Pacific Gas and Electric Company
1 organized so that they were more intelligible. And do we win
2 on every element of damages? I don't know. Maybe. We
3 certainly have a more thorough explanation of what is in the
4 claim and what it's composed of.

5 And so I just believe that it was appropriate to amend
6 it. And yeah, did I take a little longer than I should have?
7 Perhaps. But if there is a need to continue this, we offered
8 to continue it for four weeks, based on counsel's indication
9 that they want to do discovery. But again, they haven't done
10 any discovery so far, at least other than having a tree expert
11 drive by and look at this tree.

12 So I guess it seems to me that the amendments are
13 appropriate, and they'll help the Court and the parties
14 understand what the claims are, what they're based on, and that
15 could potentially lead to a resolution outside of Court.

16 THE COURT: Well, we -- excuse me. I'm sorry. I
17 didn't know I'd be coughing here. Obviously, I'm not
18 addressing any of the merits today. And whether I grant this
19 motion or deny it, we're going to have an adjudication of your
20 client's rights and the debtors' defenses. And that's the time
21 to get into the subject of what is the right amount.

22 So if the lost claimed is X versus two X, that's for a
23 proof of the matter because you are right, and I stand
24 corrected, the original claim on the electrical interruption
25 certainly did have a lost rent component. It's not a new cause

PG&E Corporation and Pacific Gas and Electric Company
1 of action.

2 One of the things that I wanted to focus on is whether
3 Mr. Greenberg is adding a new cause of action. And it doesn't
4 strike me that he is, at least the way you explained it. If
5 Mr. Dodge has a different take on that, I'll consider and
6 decide whether that's relevant. I may not -- I don't believe
7 the debtor has ever raised any statute of limitations to
8 defenses here. So I'm not going to revisit that question.

9 Okay. Go ahead. Do you want to add anything further?
10 And then you'll have a chance to respond to whatever Ms. Dodge
11 adds in her argument.

12 MR. LAPPING: Well, yes, Your Honor. I don't think
13 we're -- I think we tried not to add new causes of action.
14 We're operating with the same operative facts. And normally, I
15 don't know what the practices in your court. But in state
16 court and in other courts, federal courts, the proof comes in
17 and the parties can sometimes amend, based on what the evidence
18 is.

19 THE COURT: Well, I mean, that's general basic
20 procedural law. But when they're -- but again, what's
21 different here is we had a scheduling order, and sure, whether
22 it's state court or federal district court or the bankruptcy
23 court, generally, you have claims deadlines. Here, we had a
24 claims deadline. Your client filed proofs of claim by the
25 deadline.

PG&E Corporation and Pacific Gas and Electric Company

I think you've persuaded me that the amendments, if permitted, are relating back to the nucleus of facts that were embodied in the original proof of claim, and it's really just an additional add-on of damage. If the debtor has a different take -- at least, it appears to me that the debtor hasn't raised a statute of limitations defense.

However, what makes this case a little different is we had an agreed scheduling order, and scheduling orders replace traditional deadlines by scheduling deadlines, and that's where we'll get into the redline versus no redline, her version of -- see, in the old days, you write it out and send it to somebody. Remember, Mr. Lapping, when you and I were baby lawyers, we would mail something to somebody, and a week later you got a response back. You didn't get a text back thirty seconds later that gives opinion. So --

MS. DODGE: I did the same thing, too, Your Honor. I am --

THE COURT: You're too young.

MS. DODGE: No, I'm not. I started practicing in '94, so we did not -- I'm with you there.

THE COURT: Well, Ms. Dodge, why don't you -- why don't you respond?

I mean, this is not -- is there any theory under which you believe that Mr. Greenberg is adding a new cause of action in the traditional sense? Forget the scheduling order for a

PG&E Corporation and Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 moment. I don't think so. I mean, that's certainly the big
2 component of the electric interruption claim is lost rent,
3 almost completely. Maybe I missed one little thing, but it's
4 the main theory.

5 So you're not getting sandbagged by a new legal
6 theory, are you?

7 MS. DODGE: No. With the refrigerator claim, the main
8 component, as far as I saw it originally, was the replacement
9 of all of the wood laminate flooring that he claims the
10 refrigerator ruined. And there was a little bit of lost rent.
11 And now that's been increased by -- I don't know how many
12 months that is. And --

13 THE COURT: Well, I do. The original claim says
14 anticipated nine months and the current proposed motion is
15 twenty-four months. I mean, the --

16 MS. DODGE: Right. Right.

17 THE COURT: There is the difference. It's gone
18 from --

19 MS. DODGE: Yeah.

20 THE COURT: -- from 39,000 to 86,000.

21 MS. DODGE: Right. So again, I'm not so concerned
22 about the -- well, I shouldn't say that -- about the increase
23 in the lost rent. That component was there. That's not a new
24 theory, so it's not something we can say, oh, we're surprised
25 that you're adding a new element of damage.

PG&E Corporation and Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 What does concern me is not with the refrigerator
2 claim, but with the property damage claim under 76018, where I
3 don't think it necessarily would qualify as a new cause of
4 action, but it's a completely new theory of liability as to why
5 Mr. Greenberg believes that PG&E is liable for replacement of
6 his deck. Originally, it was that ARB, a contractor of PG&E,
7 damaged his deck when they did the work by installing the gas
8 lines from the meter to the house.

9 Now, in this proposed amended -- in the motion to
10 amend, it states that the reason PG&E is liable for replacement
11 of the deck is because PG&E didn't replace the sidewalk
12 concrete in front of his house, and that was done subsequently.
13 And then there was a water pipe that was worked on by I don't
14 know who. And in the process of working on that water pipe,
15 that was damaged. And then somehow that caused damage to the
16 deck, and that PG&E -- if PG&E had replaced the sidewalk or the
17 concrete, then that never would have happened.

18 So that's a completely new theory that is raised now
19 for the first time and by this motion to amend. I don't know
20 anything about the other parties involved. And to the extent
21 to which the Town of Fairfax is responsible for the sidewalk or
22 the property owner -- and we didn't contract, as far as I
23 know -- and when I say "we", I mean PG&E -- did not contract
24 have any contract with regard to this water pipe and the
25 damage. And if there was a water pipe damaged, of course, that

PG&E Corporation and Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 person could be responsible. I don't even know who that is.

2 So that's fine.

3 THE COURT: But doesn't that -- but Ms. Dodge, doesn't
4 that go to the merits of your defense? In other words, if you
5 proved -- if you prove that your clients did the sidewalk,
6 period, and Mr. Lapping can't prove -- I mean, let's assume
7 burden, here -- can't prove that PG&E caused the water damage,
8 then they'll lose that portion of the claim.

9 THE COURT: Well, my point is, there, is that that's a
10 completely new theory of liability from what was previously
11 asserted in the proof of claim. And I don't understand -- it's
12 not like that work, as I understand it, happened yesterday, so
13 I don't understand why the claim was not amended until less
14 than a month ago. And there's really no -- and Mr. Lapping has
15 already admitted that he could have amended these sooner.

16 And that's the issue, Your Honor. I mean, I want to
17 know what claims we're facing and what PG&E needs to do
18 discovery on, in terms of when the claims are actually -- okay,
19 these are the claims that are going to trial, and these are the
20 claims -- and again, like you said, it could be part of proof.

21 But this is a new theory of liability because he
22 realizes now that he is not going to be able to pin liability
23 on ARB because of the fact that ARB, to my understanding,
24 didn't damage the property and didn't touch his deck. So he
25 has got to come up with a new theory as to why the deck -- why

PG&E Corporation and Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 PG&E is responsible for the deck. And it's this new convoluted
2 theory.

3 And there are new items of damage that he's added in,
4 which I don't even know what some of them are, like damage to a
5 French drain system. He is claiming damages for the new water
6 pipe, a new barbecue, and damage to a --

7 THE COURT: Yeah.

8 MS. DODGE: -- Super Ladder (phonetic) and Christy box
9 (phonetic). I don't even know what that is. These are all new
10 items.

11 THE COURT: Well, okay, but hold on. The fact that
12 you don't know what it is doesn't mean you can't know, or
13 couldn't have known if there's time. But let me go back for a
14 minute. I'm looking at the amendment -- excuse me, the
15 attachment to the amendment, the proposed amendment, and that
16 does have Dennis Webb Construction estimate of 182,000 dollars.
17 That's the big ticket item, right, that's being added?

18 MR. LAPPING: Your Honor, I think that was in there
19 earlier. That's not new.

20 THE COURT: Okay. What are the -- then I'm having
21 trouble with the exhibits. What's the new addition? If Webb
22 was in there originally, then I'll take your word for it.
23 Well, if you know he went by --

24 MR. LAPPING: We are trying to --

25 THE COURT: -- almost 200 -- huh? Pardon me.

PG&E Corporation and Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 MR. LAPPING: Your Honor, we are trying to clarify a
2 few things. And I mean, if you look at our amended claim,
3 docket 11992, at page 77, it's all the way in the back.

4 THE COURT: Yeah. I'm telling you right now I haven't
5 printed it out yet.

6 MR. LAPPING: Well, that's okay.

7 THE COURT: It's an 80-page document.

8 MR. LAPPING: I'll just make the point -- I'll just
9 make the point. There's an invoice of an estimate to run the
10 new waterline under the deck, and that was also on page 117 of
11 120 of the old claim.

12 So we're not really adding that. We're clarifying it
13 because the old claim wasn't really organized well, and it was
14 hard to follow. And frankly, I don't even know where in that
15 claim there is any allegation that ARB was responsible for
16 damaging the deck. It may be in there, but I missed it.

17 And so what we're trying to do is basically look at
18 what happened at this job site and what were the damages and
19 trying to cure defects in the original claim and to clarify
20 what our claim is now.

21 THE COURT: Do you agree that at trial you're going to
22 have to prove that PG&E caused or is responsible for the deck
23 damage?

24 MR. LAPPING: Yes. It's a question of foreseeability,
25 and we'll put on evidence on that.

PG&E Corporation and Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 THE COURT: Well, or no. Maybe it is, but maybe it's
2 a question of something else came along after PG&E was doing
3 what it was doing, and somebody else damaged the deck. But if
4 that's the proof, then PG&E won't be stuck with that portion of
5 the claim, right.

6 In other words, if they damaged the gas lines, that's
7 one thing. If they damaged the deck as a consequence, that
8 follows. But if it's an intervening cause that is someone
9 else's responsibility, then you lose. You've got to prove it.
10 You have the burden, agree?

11 MR. LAPPING: I agree that I have the burden, Your
12 Honor. No question about it.

13 THE COURT: Yeah. So --

14 MS. DODGE: Your Honor, when you talk about the --

15 THE COURT: Yeah.

16 MS. DODGE: -- other parties, that's the other issue
17 is that there may be other parties that need to be added to
18 this.

19 And I want to go back to the fact you mentioned
20 before, that there is a scheduling order in place here that --
21 and I just want to disavow the notion that Mr. Lapping seems to
22 be putting forward that somehow we were tricking him or
23 something with switching words out.

24 The motion to amend deadline was one of the key issues
25 that we negotiated with regard to the scheduling order because

PG&E Corporation and Pacific Gas and Electric Company
1 it was it was originally in there, we took it out, and Mr.
2 Lamping said, no, I want to leave it in because I'm considering
3 a motion to amend.

4 And so we first had said something like fourteen days.
5 Then we wanted to get a date certain in there. And then given
6 the trial deadline that we were working under and the discovery
7 deadline of May 20th, we wanted to make sure that we would have
8 enough time. That's why we had put the deadline in of March
9 15th.

10 And I just want to point out that once you have a
11 scheduling order, it can only be modified upon good cause
12 shown. And our contention is that there is really no good
13 cause shown here.

14 I do also want to bring one other item to the Court's
15 attention that we just found out about yesterday. I received a
16 call from an attorney who represents Teichert Pipelines, who is
17 one of the contractors that was involved in entrenching to
18 place the gas line from the street to the meter. And
19 apparently, Mr. Greenberg has filed a separate action in Marin
20 County Superior Court, and he has filed that against Teichert
21 Pipelines, ARB, Bauman Landscape & Construction, and W.K.
22 McLellan.

23 And this was filed February 3rd. And it sets forth,
24 essentially, the same causes of action that relate to the
25 property damage claims here for 76018 and 78381, which are the

PG&E Corporation and Pacific Gas and Electric Company
1 property damage claims and the tree damage claims. And the
2 complaint contains causes of action for negligence, trespass to
3 timber, with regard to the redwood trees, which is in claim
4 78381, trespass to timber as to a bay tree, and then a private
5 nuisance cause of action.

6 And as I said, we just learned about this yesterday.
7 So what I'd like to ask the Court for is maybe if we can
8 reconvene in a couple of weeks to determine how we want to
9 proceed with this. Because it may be it doesn't make sense to
10 have two parallel actions, one proceeding in bankruptcy court,
11 where these parties that are named in the state court action
12 may be necessary parties or that need to be brought -- and I
13 don't even know the water pipe contractor -- to have two
14 different adjudications in two different forums.

15 THE COURT: Mr. Lapping, is this news to you, or are
16 you familiar with this litigation that she described?

17 MR. LAPPING: I am familiar with it. I am not --

18 THE COURT: Okay.

19 MR. LAPPING: -- the counsel of record in that case.

20 THE COURT: Okay. Well, so Ms. Dodge, what you are
21 doing is saying, let's have a further timeout. I mean, that,
22 by definition, it's going to change the scheduling order, but
23 obviously it makes no sense to litigate twice what could be
24 litigated once. I don't know whether you would try to remove
25 those matters here or suggest that this matter be sent out. I

PG&E Corporation and Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 don't know. I mean, there ought to be some sensible way to do
2 it efficiently.

3 MS. DODGE: Well, it does, Your Honor -- I'm sorry to
4 interrupt.

5 THE COURT: No.

6 MS. DODGE: The state court action does not address
7 the refrigerator claim. So the refrigerator claim is not
8 affected by that state court action. So regardless of what
9 decision is made with the property damage actions -- with the
10 gas line work and the tree issue -- the refrigerator claim is
11 before you, and that would --

12 THE COURT: You can't get --

13 MS. DODGE: -- need to be adjudicated.

14 THE COURT: You can't get the tree guy for the
15 smelly --

16 MS. DODGE: Yeah. No, Your Honor --

17 THE COURT: -- (indiscernible).

18 MS. DODGE: -- you're stuck with the refrigerator
19 claim.

20 THE COURT: Yeah. Well, so. But Ms. Dodge, it
21 probably makes no sense to bifurcate the disputes into three
22 parts, either. I mean, maybe it does. I don't know.

23 Well, so what would you suggest that I do today, then?
24 Just restate it, so we're clear. Ms. Dodge, you're call.

25 MS. DODGE: Right. I would like -- as I said, I just

PG&E Corporation and Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 learned about this yesterday.

2 THE COURT: Right.

3 MS. DODGE: I would like to maybe reconvene in a week
4 or so before Your Honor to have a chance to discuss with Mr.
5 Lapping and see what the best way is to proceed.

6 THE COURT: Mr. Lapping, what do you think of that?

7 MR. LAPPING: Well, Your Honor, I have to be open to
8 that. I'm not sure that it needs -- I mean, I think you could
9 grant this motion today on a couple of different grounds. And
10 when you look at the scheduling order and say, well, for good
11 cause -- the claims are bad condition. They needed to get
12 spruced up so that they were more intelligible.

13 And that's a good reason to allow us to get around the
14 problem with the scheduling order. That, and the fact that it
15 wasn't just a negotiation over the timing. It was changing
16 from filed to hearing and then creating a situation where the
17 order couldn't possibly be complied with because of the timing.
18 That's a different -- that's a substantive change.

19 But I don't have a problem with delaying this, I
20 suppose, to allow PG&E to investigate whatever claim this is.
21 And --

22 THE COURT: Well, I mean, obviously --

23 MR. LAPPING: -- so you --

24 THE COURT: -- if I had -- if I had announced at the
25 start of the hearing that I was granting your motion, I'm sure

PG&E Corporation and Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 Ms. Dodge would still -- she might be mad at me, but she would
2 still say, we've got this other new development. So --

3 MR. LAPPING: Um-hum.

4 THE COURT: But I have to go back and kind of gauge my
5 thinking about this. What if there only had been refrigerator
6 claim? Would I have punished Mr. Greenberg or his counsel by
7 saying you can't amend, when my instincts tell me amending to
8 increase a measure of damage that was already alleged and to be
9 getting up to speed is not really a new claim. It's just an
10 additional fact.

11 And similarly, if we had gone to trial and you put on
12 your case and you said we have three years' worth of lost rent,
13 if Ms. Dodge says, wait a minute, you only plead one year, I
14 probably would have said, come on, we're figuring out what the
15 violation of rights were, and what the consequences are are
16 something a little different.

17 And I have to say that, given the Ninth Circuit's
18 repeated admonition about liberal claim amendments, I am not,
19 at this point in my career, interested in throwing a claimant
20 and his lawyer into the trash can because of a word processing
21 formatting error. We all make those kinds of errors.

22 And again, I go back to the old days, when we didn't
23 have (audio interference) lines and margins and Microsoft Word
24 making things even more difficult. Those things didn't happen.
25 You didn't have redlines. You mailed your opponent a proposed

PG&E Corporation and Pacific Gas and Electric Company
1 amendment, and a week later, you got back no or yes.

2 So let's put it this way. Ms. Dodge, this is a direct
3 way of saying, I'm prepared to call a timeout while you and
4 your clients figure out what to do about this new development
5 and talk to Mr. Lapping. But I think, in fairness, I'm
6 persuaded that the claim should be amended as requested,
7 notwithstanding the scheduling order. Scheduling orders are
8 for the benefit of the parties and the court, but my scheduling
9 order is always subject to making sense and doing the right
10 thing, and that's what I think the law requires.

11 And so why don't we do this. I would say that my
12 inclination is that, without even getting down to the
13 formatting error, that this isn't bringing in a new theory that
14 maybe would create new defenses, at least said timing defenses.
15 I don't want to misstate my case. If Mr. Greenberg was adding
16 a theory that PG&E has an absolute defense to saying, we didn't
17 do it, then they're not going to lose that defense by granting
18 this motion because the granting of the motion just grants the
19 motion. It doesn't kill any defenses.

20 But I'm also going to be -- I'm also willing to call a
21 timeout for a couple of weeks. And if that means take the
22 trial off calendar, so be it, or not. And Ms. Dodge, perhaps
23 in a short continuance, you'll decide you want to go forward on
24 schedule or do something. I know you wanted me to grant more
25 time on this trial, and I'm inclined to do it, but not if it's

PG&E Corporation and Pacific Gas and Electric Company
1 just to measure three months' worth as one month.

2 If it is to measure the impact on the parties by this
3 new development, then obviously that's far more important.

4 So I don't want to mislead you. Are you clear on what
5 my thinking is here?

6 MS. DODGE: I believe so, Your Honor. I understand
7 we'll just -- like you said, take a timeout to determine how we
8 want to proceed with regard to this pending state action. And
9 like I said, though, that doesn't impact the refrigerator
10 claim. And I know that --

11 THE COURT: Well, no, and if you told me you think
12 it's more efficient to separate out the refrigerator claim, and
13 it makes sense to stay on the schedule for the trial of the
14 refrigerator claim, I guess we'll do it. It seems like it
15 might be inefficient, but maybe that's the best result.

16 And if you think that, on further reflection, you're
17 better off litigating everything with Mr. Greenberg, at least
18 that can be done here, but you need some more time, I'm
19 amenable to that, too. My schedule is not horribly difficult
20 these days. So I'm not wedded to the trial date that we set.

21 Let me rephrase it where we are, so you take back to
22 your clients what did the crazy judge do? The crazy judge
23 decided that I'm not going to decide on the merits here based
24 upon a formatting miscommunication between two experienced
25 counsel who probably do not make it their habit to play hide-

PG&E Corporation and Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 the-ball and send the guy a redline that doesn't have the real
2 redline. And I'm satisfied that Mr. Lapping has persuaded me
3 that, in large measure for both claims, the amendments appear
4 appropriate.

5 So my tentative thinking is to grant the motion to
6 permit the amendment of the two claims that are the subject of
7 it, 76018 and 77335, as requested in the motion, to, for the
8 moment, keep the trial on schedule for our trial date but to
9 reconvene this hearing in a couple of weeks to let counsel on
10 both sides, but particularly the debtors' side, figure out what
11 they want to do based upon this new development that impacts
12 the gas line claim but not the refrigeration claim.

13 And if the best consensus is that the matter should be
14 bifurcated, I guess we'll stay on track for the refrigeration
15 claim. If it should be continued together or something else
16 we'll vacate the trial scheduling order and -- dare I risk --
17 issue another trial scheduling order, with no more amendments
18 permitted, Mr. Lapping.

19 MR. LAPPING: Okay.

20 THE COURT: Now, we have a regular PG&E calendar
21 coming up, Mr. Rupp. I believe it's on the 26, right?

22 You're muted.

23 MS. DODGE: You're on mute.

24 MR. RUPP: Your Honor, we have one before then on
25 April 12.

PG&E Corporation and Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 THE COURT: Okay. How about if we just put this over
2 to April 12th, Ms. Dodge, and you and Mr. Lapping and your
3 client figure out -- I mean, look, you're perfectly willing to
4 settle this case. I know you've tried before. But shall I ask
5 Mr. Rupp and the company to fire up one of their mediators to
6 try again?

7 MS. DODGE: Yeah, we tried that, Your Honor, and we
8 couldn't even get a counter. So the fact that we've not gotten
9 a counter and now the claims are increased by 240,00 dollars is
10 not a good sign.

11 THE COURT: Well, okay. Then --

12 MS. DODGE: I wish.

13 THE COURT: Let's put it -- well --

14 MR. LAPPING: I'd like to say what the offer was, but
15 it now appears --

16 THE COURT: No, no. Don't.

17 MR. LAPPING: Yeah.

18 THE COURT: I don't want you to. Mr. Rupp knows that
19 PG&E has a bunch of trained pit bulls locked up in the
20 mediation cage, and I let one of them out, maybe they'll get
21 this thing fixed.

22 But in the meantime, I'm doing this. I'm making, on
23 the record, a tentative ruling, tentatively, that I'm going to
24 grant Mr. Greenberg's motion to amend both claims as requested.
25 But I'm going to make a final decision on that, on what we do

PG&E Corporation and Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 and what is the fate of these matters, at a hearing we'll set
2 for now on April 12th at 10 o'clock.

3 And Ms. Dodge, this is not an indirect way of saying I
4 want to revisit the question. I mean, you've made your point.
5 I've made my point. I'm going to let the claims get amended.
6 I'm just not going to just sign any orders or make any
7 definitive decisions until I hear back from you.

8 And you, counsel, are free to work something out on
9 your own and to avoid the hearing on April 12th. Ms. Parada
10 can easily accommodate you if there's an agreement to split the
11 things or reschedule or do something. We don't have to go
12 through the expense of your clients and all of us having a
13 fancy hearing. You can do it by conversations with Ms. Parada
14 if it works otherwise.

15 If not, I'll assume that on the 12th at 10 o'clock
16 calendar, we'll talk about what we're doing with the amended
17 claims. But --

18 MS. DODGE: Your Honor, I just want to make clear for
19 the record, that, as you said, we'll revisit this on April
20 12th, but if the claims are amended, that the debtors will be
21 allowed additional time for this new theory, in terms of the
22 claim regarding the deck.

23 THE COURT: Yes. Yes. Let's make that clear. Yes.
24 I still think, my own sense, it's probably not cost effective
25 to split out the refrigeration claim, but maybe it is. And if

PG&E Corporation and Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 that's the desire of PG&E, perhaps we'll just have a trial on
2 refrigeration. To use your term, I'm stuck with this rotten
3 food. We'll get the animal feces that's in the other claim
4 until I get that one right.

5 But I'll consider your wishes and your desires for
6 moving the schedule for either both claims or the damaged gas
7 line after you've had a chance to reflect on it with your
8 client and assess what you wanted to do on this new
9 development.

10 And we won't talk about redlines. And from now on in
11 this case, I want you all to do it all in handwritten form by
12 United States mail.

13 MR. LAPPING: Okay.

14 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you all for you time.

15 MS. DODGE: You know that they don't even teach kids
16 cursive in school anymore, I just found out. Isn't that
17 strange? I mean, do you remember learning cursive when we were
18 in elementary school? They said that kids don't --

19 THE COURT: Oh, yeah.

20 MS. DODGE: -- even learn that anymore. They don't
21 know how to write -- they don't know how to handwrite. They
22 can print, but they can't --

23 THE COURT: Well, I have some of the worst handwriting
24 in the world. I took the Palmer Method in grammar school, and
25 I can find something that I signed when I was ten. It's

PG&E Corporation and Pacific Gas and Electric Company

1 legible then.

2 MS. DODGE: Not anymore.

3 MR. LAPPING: Yeah, mine isn't either. All right.

4 Thank you, Your Honor.

5 MS. DODGE: All right.

6 THE COURT: Thank you for your time, everyone.

7 MS. DODGE: Thank you.

8 MR. LAPPING: See you in a couple weeks.

9 THE COURT: Everyone have a good day.

10 MR. LAPPING: All right.

11 MR. RUPP: Thank you, Your Honor.

12 THE COURT: Thank you. Bye.

13 (Whereupon these proceedings were concluded at 10:36 AM)

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

INDEX

2

RULINGS: PAGE LINE

3

Motion to amend claims 77335 and 76018 24 24

4

tentatively granted

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 C E R T I F I C A T I O N
2
34 I, River Wolfe, certify that the foregoing transcript is a true
5 and accurate record of the proceedings.
6
710 _____
11 /s/ RIVER WOLFE
12
13 eScribers
14 7227 N. 16th Street, Suite #207
15 Phoenix, AZ 85020
16
17 Date: March 30, 2022
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

A	agreed (1) 9:8 agreement (1) 25:10 ahead (2) 6:21;8:9 allegation (1) 14:15 alleged (1) 20:8 allocation (2) 3:17,23 allow (2) 19:13,20 allowed (1) 25:21 almost (2) 10:3;13:25 along (1) 15:2 always (1) 21:9 amenable (1) 22:19 amend (8) 7:5;8:17;11:10,19; 15:24;16:3;20:7; 24:24 amended (8) 11:9;12:13,15;14:2; 21:6;25:5,16,20 amending (1) 20:7 amendment (6) 4:20;13:14,15,15; 21:1;23:6 amendments (5) 7:12;9:1;20:18; 23:3,17 amount (2) 6:8;7:21 animal (1) 26:3 announced (1) 19:24 answered (1) 6:21 anticipated (2) 3:22;10:14 anymore (3) 26:16,20;27:2 apparently (1) 16:19 appear (2) 3:23;23:3 appearances (1) 3:8 appearing (1) 3:15 appears (2) 9:5;24:15 appropriate (3) 7:5,13;23:4	April (5) 23:25;24:2;25:2,9, 19 ARB (5) 11:6;12:23,23; 14:15;16:21 argument (4) 3:20;4:1;6:22;8:11 around (1) 19:13 aside (1) 4:3 asserted (1) 12:11 assess (1) 26:8 assume (2) 12:6;25:15 attachment (1) 13:15 attention (1) 16:15 attorney (1) 16:16 audio (1) 20:23 avoid (1) 25:9	3:10,12,15 believes (1) 11:5 benefit (1) 21:8 Benvenutti (1) 3:12 best (3) 19:5;22:15;23:13 better (1) 22:17 bifurcate (1) 18:21 bifurcated (1) 23:14 big (2) 10:1;13:17 biggest (2) 4:9;6:20 bit (1) 10:10 both (5) 4:9;23:3,10;24:24; 26:6 box (1) 13:8 bring (2) 3:6;16:14 bringing (1) 21:13 brought (1) 17:12 bulls (1) 24:19 bunch (1) 24:19 burden (3) 12:7;15:10,11 Bye (1) 27:12	20:19 case (8) 4:22;6:2;9:7;17:19; 20:12;21:15;24:4; 26:11 cause (9) 7:25;8:3;9:24;11:3; 15:8;16:11,13;17:5; 19:11 caused (3) 11:15;12:7;14:22 causes (3) 8:13;16:24;17:2 certain (1) 16:5 certainly (4) 5:8;7:3,25;10:1 chance (3) 8:10;19:4;26:7 change (2) 17:22;19:18 changing (1) 19:15 Christy (1) 13:8 Circuit's (1) 20:17 claim (53) 4:18,18,21;5:5,7,16, 17:6;2,2,3,6,10,17,17, 18:7;4,24;8:24;9:3; 10:2,7,13;11:2,2;12:8, 11,13;14:2,11,13,15, 19,20;15:5;17:3;18:7, 7,10,19;19:20;20:6,9, 18:21;6:22;10,12,14; 23:12,12,15;25:22,25; 26:3 claimant (1) 20:19 claimed (1) 7:22 claiming (1) 13:5 claims (23) 4:9,23;6:25;7:14; 8:23,24;10:9;12:17, 18,19,20;16:25;17:1, 1:19;11;23:3,6;24:9, 24:25;5,17,20;26:6 clarified (1) 5:17 clarify (2) 14:1,19 clarifying (1) 14:12 clear (4) 18:24;22:4;25:18, 23 CLERK (1) 3:4 client (4) 5:16;8:24;24:3;
B	baby (1) 9:12 back (11) 9:2,14,14;13:13; 14:3;15:19;20:4,22; 21:1;22:21;25:7 background (1) 6:23 bad (1) 19:11 bankruptcy (2) 8:22;17:10 barbecue (1) 13:6 based (5) 7:8,14;8:17;22:23; 23:11 basic (1) 8:19 basically (2) 4:21;14:17 Bauman (1) 16:21 bay (1) 17:4 befuddled (1) 4:24 beg (1) 5:10 begin (1) 5:14 behalf (3)	baby (1) 9:12 back (11) 9:2,14,14;13:13; 14:3;15:19;20:4,22; 21:1;22:21;25:7 background (1) 6:23 bad (1) 19:11 bankruptcy (2) 8:22;17:10 barbecue (1) 13:6 based (5) 7:8,14;8:17;22:23; 23:11 basic (1) 8:19 basically (2) 4:21;14:17 Bauman (1) 16:21 bay (1) 17:4 befuddled (1) 4:24 beg (1) 5:10 begin (1) 5:14 behalf (3)	cage (1) 24:20 calculation (1) 5:21 calendar (3) 21:22;23:20;25:16 CALIFORNIA (1) 3:1 Call (5) 3:3;16:16;18:24; 21:3,20 Calling (1) 3:5 came (3) 4:11;5:21;15:2 can (10) 8:17;10:24;16:11; 17:7;20:20;22:18; 25:10,13;26:22,25 career (1)	cage (1) 24:20 calculation (1) 5:21 calendar (3) 21:22;23:20;25:16 CALIFORNIA (1) 3:1 Call (5) 3:3;16:16;18:24; 21:3,20 Calling (1) 3:5 came (3) 4:11;5:21;15:2 can (10) 8:17;10:24;16:11; 17:7;20:20;22:18; 25:10,13;26:22,25 career (1)

26:8	11:22,23,24	5:5;6:14,15;10:14	19:19	down (2)
clients (4)	contractor (2)	cursive (2)	Dennis (2)	4:25;21:12
12:5;21:4;22:22; 25:12	11:6;17:13	26:16,17	3:5;13:16	drain (1)
client's (1)	contractors (1)	D	deny (1)	13:5
7:20	16:17		7:19	drive (1)
clock (1)	conversations (1)		describe (1)	7:11
4:2	25:13		4:21	during (1)
coming (1)	convoluted (1)		17:16	5:19
23:21	13:1		desire (2)	
company (1)	Corporation (1)		3:18;26:1	E
24:5	3:5		desires (1)	
complaint (1)	corrected (1)		26:5	earlier (1)
17:2	7:24		determine (2)	13:19
completely (4)	correctly (1)		17:8;22:7	early (1)
10:3;11:4;18;12:10	5:6		development (5)	4:6
completion (2)	cost (1)		20:2;21:4;22:3;	easily (1)
5:12;6:12	25:24		23:11;26:9	25:10
complied (1)	coughing (1)		difference (1)	effective (1)
19:17	7:17		10:17	25:24
component (5)	counsel (7)		differences (1)	efficient (1)
4:18;7:25;10:2,8,23	3:6;4:7;17:19;20:6;		4:3	22:12
components (1)	22:25;23:9;25:8		different (10)	efficiently (1)
6:19	counsel's (1)		5:11;8:5;21:9:4;7;	18:2
composed (1)	7:8		17:14;14:19:9;18;	either (3)
7:4	counter (2)		20:16	18:22;26:6;27:3
concept (1)	24:8,9		difficult (2)	electric (1)
5:22	County (1)		20:24;22:19	10:2
concern (1)	16:20		direct (1)	electrical (2)
11:1	couple (6)		21:2	5:2;7:24
concerned (1)	6:19;17:8;19:9; 21:21;23:9;27:8		disavow (1)	element (2)
10:21	course (1)		15:21	7:2;10:25
concluded (1)	11:25		discovery (4)	elementary (1)
27:13	Court (72)		7:9;10;12:18;16:6	26:18
concrete (2)	3:3,4,7,13,16,21; 4:14,16,25;5:4;6:1,		discreet (1)	else (3)
11:12,17	15:7;13,15,16;8:15, 16,19,22,22,23;9:18,		3:24	15:2,3;23:15
condition (1)	21:10;13,17,20;12:3, 9:13;7,11,20,25;14:4,		discuss (1)	else's (1)
19:11	7,21;15:1,13,15; 16:20;17:7,10,11,15,		19:4	15:9
consensus (1)	18,20;18:5,6,8,12,14, 17,20;19:2,6,22,24;		disputes (1)	embodied (1)
23:13	20:4;21:8;22:11; 23:20;24:1,11,13,16,		18:21	9:3
consequence (1)	18:25;23:26;14,19, 23:27;6,9,12		district (1)	enough (1)
15:7	courts (2)		8:22	16:8
consequences (1)	8:16,16		divide (1)	entitlement (1)
20:15	Court's (1)		3:17	5:8
consider (2)	16:14		docket (1)	entrenching (1)
8:5;26:5	crazy (2)		14:3	16:17
considering (1)	22:22,22		document (1)	error (2)
16:2	create (1)		14:7	20:21;21:13
construction (3)	21:14		Dodge (44)	errors (1)
6:12;13:16;16:21	creating (1)		3:7,9,9,16,19:8:5,	20:21
contains (1)	19:16		10:9;16,19,21;10:7,	essentially (1)
17:2	creditor (1)		16,19,21;12:3;13:8;	16:24
contention (1)	3:15		15:14;16,17;20:18:3,	estimate (2)
16:12	cure (1)		6,13,16,18,20,24,25;	13:16;14:9
context (1)	14:19		19:3;20:1,13;21:2,22;	even (10)
4:11	current (4)		22:6;23:23;24:2,7,12;	12:1;13:4,9;14:14;
continuance (1)			25:3,18;26:15,20;	17:13;20:24;21:12;
21:23			27:2,5,7	24:8;26:15,20
continue (2)			dollars (4)	events (1)
7:7,8			5:25;6:7;13:16;	4:5
continued (1)			24:9	everyone (2)
23:15			done (3)	27:6,9
contract (3)			7:9;11:12;22:18	evidence (2)
				8:17;14:25

excuse (2) 7:16;13:14	fine (1) 12:2	generally (1) 8:23	himself (1) 4:6	intervening (1) 15:8
exhibit (1) 6:9	fire (1) 24:5	given (2) 16:5;20:17	Hold (2) 6:3;13:11	into (4) 7:21;9:10;18:21; 20:20
exhibits (1) 13:21	first (3) 3:25;11:19;16:4	gives (1) 9:15	Honor (26) 3:6,9,11,14,19; 4:12;5:15;6:9,24; 8:12;9:16;12:16; 13:18;14:1;15:12,14; 18:3,16;19:4,7;22:6; 23:24;24:7;25:18; 27:4,11	investigate (1) 19:20
expense (1) 25:12	five (1) 4:8	Good (10) 3:7,9,11,14;16:11, 12:19;10,13;24:10; 27:9	Honorable (1) 3:4	invoice (1) 14:9
experienced (1) 22:24	fixed (1) 24:21	grammar (1) 26:24	horribly (1) 22:19	involved (4) 4:13,16;11:20; 16:17
expert (1) 7:10	flooring (1) 10:9	grant (6) 6:17;7:18;19:9; 21:24;23:5;24:24	house (2) 11:8,12	issue (6) 3:20,24;12:16; 15:16;18:10;23:17
explained (1) 8:4	focus (1) 8:2	granting (3) 19:25;21:17,18	huh (1) 13:25	issues (1) 15:24
explanation (1) 7:3	follow (1) 14:14	grants (1) 21:18		item (4) 4:19;5:6;13:17; 16:14
extent (2) 3:20;11:20	follows (1) 15:8	greater (1) 4:21		items (3) 6:11;13:3,10
F				
facing (1) 12:17	foreseeability (1) 14:24	Greenberg (9) 3:15;4:6;8:3;9:24; 11:5;16:19;20:6; 21:15;22:17	I	
fact (7) 5:17;12:23;13:11; 15:19;19:14;20:10; 24:8	forget (2) 5:18;9:25	Greenberg's (1) 24:24	J	
facts (2) 8:14;9:2	form (2) 4:5;26:11	grounds (1) 19:9	Jennifer (1) 3:9	
Fairfax (1) 11:21	formatting (3) 20:21;21:13;22:24	guess (3) 7:12;22:14;23:14	job (1) 14:18	
fairness (1) 21:5	forth (2) 4:22;16:23	guy (2) 18:14;23:1	judge (2) 22:22,22	
familiar (2) 17:16,17	forums (1) 17:14	K		
fancy (1) 25:13	forward (2) 15:22;21:23	H		
far (4) 7:10;10:8;11:22; 22:3	found (2) 16:15;26:16	habit (1) 22:25	keep (1) 23:8	
fast (1) 5:1	four (1) 7:8	half (1) 4:8	Keller (1) 3:12	
fate (1) 25:1	fourteen (1) 16:4	handwrite (1) 26:21	key (1) 15:24	
February (1) 16:23	FRANCISCO (1) 3:1	handwriting (1) 26:23	kids (2) 26:15,18	
feces (1) 26:3	frankly (1) 14:14	handwritten (1) 26:11	kill (2) 6:4;21:19	
federal (2) 8:16,22	free (1) 25:8	happen (1) 20:24	Kim (1) 3:12	
few (1) 14:2	French (1) 13:5	happened (3) 11:17;12:12;14:18	kind (2) 4:23;20:4	
figure (3) 21:4;23:10;24:3	front (1) 11:12	hard (1) 14:14	kinds (1) 20:21	
figuring (1) 20:14	further (3) 8:9;17:21;22:16	hear (2) 3:20;25:7	known (1) 13:13	
filed (5) 8:24;16:19,20,23; 19:16	G	hearing (6) 19:16,25;23:9;25:1, 9,13	knows (1) 24:18	
final (1) 24:25	gas (8) 6:2,6;11:7;15:6; 16:18;18:10;23:12; 26:6	help (1) 7:13	L	
find (1) 26:25	gauge (1) 20:4	here's (1) 4:3	Ladder (1) 13:8	
	general (1) 8:19	hide- (1) 22:25	lamine (1) 10:9	
			Lamping (1) 16:2	

Landscape (1)	22:17	15:17;16:7;17:9,12	7:1,3;19:12;20:24;	17:5
16:21	litigation (1)	5:7,10;6:8;7:2;	21:24;22:3,12,18;	number (1)
Lapping (42)	17:16	10:3;15:1,1;17:7;	23:17	6:6
3:13,14,15,25;4:12,	little (5)	18:22;19:3;21:14;	morning (4)	O
15,17;5:3,15;6:9,24;	7:6;9:7;10:3,10;	22:15;24:20;25:25	3:7,9,11,14	
8:12;9:12;12:6,14;	20:16	McLellan (1)	motion (17)	
13:18,24;14:1,6,8,24;	24:19	16:22	4:11;5:5;6:17;7:19;	
15:11,21;17:15,17,19;	long (1)	mean (19)	10:14;11:9,19;15:24;	
19:5,6,7,23;20:3;	4:7	3:17;6:24;8:19;	16:3;19:9,25;21:18,	
21:5;23:2,18,19;24:2,	longer (1)	9:23;10:1,15;11:23;	18,19;23:5,7;24:24	
14,17;26:13;27:3,8,10	7:6	12:6,16;13:12;14:2;	moving (1)	
large (1)	look (5)	17:21;18:1,22;19:8,	26:6	
23:3	7:11;14:2,17;19:10;	22:24;3:25;4:26:17	mute (1)	
later (3)	24:3	means (1)	23:23	
9:13,14;21:1	looked (5)	21:21	muted (1)	
law (2)	5:6,9,9,16;6:16	meantime (1)	23:22	
8:20;21:10	looking (2)	24:22	N	
lawyer (1)	4:18;13:14	measure (5)		
20:20	looks (1)	5:8;20:8;22:1,2;	named (1)	
lawyers (1)	6:6	23:3	17:11	
9:12	lose (3)	mediation (1)	near (1)	
lead (2)	12:8;15:9;21:17	24:20	5:8	
3:19;7:15	lost (17)	mediators (1)	necessarily (1)	
learn (1)	4:10,10,10,17,19;	24:5	11:3	
26:20	5:4,11,24;6:3,11,19;	mentioned (1)	necessary (2)	
learned (2)	7:22,25;10:2,10,23;	15:19	5:13;17:12	
17:6;19:1	20:12	merits (3)	need (5)	
learning (1)	lower (1)	7:18;12:4;22:23	7:7;15;17;17:12;	
26:17	5:18	meter (2)	18:13;22:18	
least (5)		11:8;16:18	needed (2)	
7:10;8:4;9:5;21:14;		Method (1)	5:17;19:11	
22:17		26:24	needs (2)	
leave (1)		Microsoft (1)	12:17;19:8	
16:2		20:23	negligence (1)	
Leaving (1)		might (2)	17:2	
4:3		20:1;22:15	negotiated (1)	
legal (1)		mine (1)	15:25	
10:5		27:3	negotiation (1)	
legible (1)		minute (3)	19:15	
27:1		6:3;13;14;20:13	new (34)	
less (1)		miscommunication (1)	5:7,7,7;6:3;7:25;	
12:13		22:24	8:3;13;9:24;10:5,23,	
liability (4)		mislead (1)	25:11;3,4,18;12:10,	
11:4;12:10,21,22		22:4	21,25;13:1,3,5,6,9,19,	
liable (2)		missed (2)	21:14;10:20;2,9;21:4,	
11:5,10		10:3;14:16	13,14;22:3;23:11;	
liberal (1)		misstate (1)	25:21;26:8	
20:18		21:15	news (1)	
limitations (2)		modified (1)	17:15	
8:7;9:6		16:11	nine (2)	
line (5)		moment (2)	6:13;10:14	
6:6;16:18;18:10;		10:1;23:8	Ninth (1)	
23:12;26:7		Montali (1)	20:17	
lines (4)	20:23	3:5	normally (1)	
6:2;11:8;15:6;	Marin (1)	month (2)	8:14	
20:23	16:19	12:14;22:1	notion (1)	
Listen (1)	3:5;7:23;17:25;	months (6)	15:21	
6:21	23:13	5:24;6:12,13;10:12,	notwithstanding (1)	
litigate (1)	matters (2)	14,15	21:7	
17:23	17:25;25:1	months' (1)	nucleus (1)	
litigated (1)	may (8)	22:1	9:2	
17:24	3:8;6:19;8:6;14:16;	more (9)	nuisance (1)	
litigating (1)				25:14

ought (1) 18:1	PG&E (19) 3:5;11:5,6,10,11,16, 16,23;12:7,17;13:1; 14:22;15:2,4;19:20; 21:16;23:20;24:19; 26:1	proceedings (1) 27:13 process (1) 11:14 processing (1) 20:20 phone (2) 6:4,4 phonetic (2) 13:8,9 pin (1) 12:22 pipe (6) 11:13,14,24,25; 13:6;17:13 Pipelines (2) 16:16,21 pit (1) 24:19 place (2) 15:20;16:18 play (1) 22:25 plead (1) 20:13 please (1) 3:8 point (8) 4:20;12:9;14:8,9; 16:10;20:19;25:4,5 portion (2) 12:8;15:4 possibly (1) 19:17 potentially (1) 7:15 practices (1) 8:15 practicing (1) 9:19 prepared (1) 21:3 presiding (1) 3:5 previously (1) 12:10 print (1) 26:22 printed (1) 14:5 private (1) 17:4 probably (4) 18:21;20:14;22:25; 25:24 problem (2) 19:14,19 procedural (1) 8:20 proceed (3) 17:9;19:5;22:8 proceeding (1) 17:10	17:19;24:23;25:19 redline (5) 4:4;9:10,10;23:1,2 redlines (2) 20:25;26:10 redwood (1) 17:3 reflect (1) 26:7 reflection (1) 22:16 refrigeration (4) 23:12,14;25:25; 26:2 refrigerator (11) 10:7,10;11:1;18:7, 7,10,18;20:5;22:9,12, 14 regard (4) 11:24;15:25;17:3; 22:8 regarding (1) 25:22 regardless (1) 18:8 regular (1) 23:20 put (6) 14:25;16:8;20:11; 21:2;24:1,13 putting (1) 15:22	21:10 reschedule (1) 25:11 resolution (1) 7:15 respond (2) 8:10;9:22 response (1) 9:14 responsibility (1) 15:9 responsible (5) 11:21;12:1;13:1; 14:15,22 restate (1) 18:24 Restaurants (1) 4:22 result (1) 22:15 revisit (3) 8:8;25:4,19 Richard (1) 3:14 Right (18) 4:17;5:2;7:21,23; 10:16,16,21;13:17; 14:4;15:5;18:25;19:2; 21:9;23:21;26:4;27:3, 5,10 rights (2) 7:20;20:15 ringing (1) 6:4 risk (1) 23:16 rotten (1) 26:2 ruined (1) 10:10 ruling (1) 24:23 run (1) 14:9 Rupp (10) 3:8,11,11,16,22; 23:21,24;24:5,18; 27:11
P		Q		S
page (2) 14:3,10		qualify (1) 11:3		Sambo's (1) 4:22
Palmer (1) 26:24				same (3) 8:14;9:16;16:24
paperwork (1) 6:16				SAN (1) 3:1
Parada (2) 25:9,13				sandbagged (1) 10:5
parallel (1) 17:10				sat (1) 5:15
pardon (2) 5:10;13:25				satisfied (1) 23:2
part (1) 12:20				
particularly (1) 4:21				
particularly (1) 23:10				
parties (9) 7:13;8:17;11:20; 15:16,17;17:11,12; 21:8;22:2				
parts (1) 18:22				
passage (1) 5:22				
pencils (1) 5:24				
pending (1) 22:8				
perfectly (1) 24:3				
Perhaps (3) 7:7;21:22;26:1				
period (2) 5:19;12:6				
permit (1) 23:6				
permitted (2) 9:2;23:18				
person (1) 12:1				
persuaded (3) 9:1;21:6;23:2				

saw (1) 10:8	20:11	6:18 substantive (1) 19:18	thorough (1) 7:3	4:1 twenty-four (2) 5:24;10:15
saying (5) 17:21;20:7;21:3,16; 25:3	sit (1) 5:21	suggest (2) 17:25;18:23	though (1) 22:9	twice (1) 17:23
schedule (5) 21:24;22:13,19; 23:8;26:6	site (1) 14:18	sum (1) 6:18	three (3) 18:21;20:12;22:1	two (6) 7:22;17:10,13,14; 22:24;23:6
scheduling (16) 8:21;9:8,8,9,25; 15:20,25;16:11; 17:22;19:10,14;21:7, 7,8;23:16,17	situation (1) 19:16	summary (2) 6:10,16	throwing (1) 20:19	
school (3) 26:16,18,24	six (1) 4:5	Super (1) 13:8	ticket (1) 13:17	U
seconds (1) 9:14	Slow (1) 4:25	Superior (1) 16:20	timber (2) 17:3,4	
section (1) 5:11	smaller (1) 6:19	suppose (1) 19:20	timeout (4) 17:21;21:3,21;22:7	
seem (1) 4:9	smelly (1) 18:15	sure (4) 8:21;16:7;19:8,25	timing (3) 19:15,17;21:14	
seemed (1) 6:19	somebody (3) 9:11,13;15:3	surprised (1) 10:24	today (3) 7:18;18:23;19:9	
seems (3) 7:12;15:21;22:14	somehow (2) 11:15;15:22	switch (1) 6:1	Todd (1) 3:15	
send (2) 9:11;23:1	someone (1) 15:8	switching (1) 15:23	together (1) 23:15	
sense (7) 9:25;17:9,23;18:21; 21:9;22:13;25:24	sometimes (1) 8:17	system (1) 13:5	told (1) 22:11	
sensible (1) 18:1	sooner (1) 12:15		took (2) 16:1;26:24	
sent (1) 17:25	sorry (2) 7:16;18:3		touch (1) 12:24	
separate (2) 16:19;22:12	speed (1) 20:9		Town (1) 11:21	
session (1) 3:4	split (2) 25:10,25		track (1) 23:14	
set (3) 4:22;22:20;25:1	spruced (1) 19:12		traditional (2) 9:9,25	
sets (1) 16:23	stand (1) 7:23		trained (1) 24:19	
settle (1) 24:4	start (2) 5:1;19:25		trash (1) 20:20	
shall (1) 24:4	started (1) 9:19		tree (6) 7:10,11;17:1,4; 18:10,14	
short (1) 21:23	state (6) 8:15,22;17:11;18:6, 8:22:8		trees (1) 17:3	
show (1) 5:23	states (2) 11:10;26:12		trespass (2) 17:2,4	
shown (2) 16:12,13	statute (2) 8:7;9:6		trial (13) 12:19;14:21;16:6; 20:11;21:22,25;	
side (1) 23:10	stay (2) 22:13;23:14		22:13,20;23:8,8,16, 17:26:1	
sides (1) 23:10	still (3) 20:1,2;25:24		tricking (1) 15:22	
sidewalk (4) 11:11,16,21;12:5	strange (1) 26:17		tried (3) 8:13;24:4,7	
sign (2) 24:10;25:6	street (1) 16:18		trouble (1) 13:21	
signed (1) 26:25	strike (1) 8:4		try (2) 17:24;24:6	
similarly (1)	stuck (3) 15:4;18:18;26:2		trying (4) 13:24;14:1,17,19	
	subject (3) 7:21;21:9;23:6		TUESDAY (1) 3:1	
	subsequently (1) 11:12		turn (1)	
	substantial (1) 3:11			Webb (2)

13:16,21 wedded (1) 22:20 week (3) 9:13;19:3;21:1 weeks (5) 7:8;17:8;21:21; 23:9;27:8 what's (4) 3:18;5:13;8:20; 13:21 Whereupon (1) 27:13 whole (1) 4:20 willing (2) 21:20;24:3 win (1) 7:1 wish (2) 6:22;24:12 wishes (1) 26:5 without (1) 21:12 WK (1) 16:21 wood (1) 10:9 Word (4) 4:4;13:22;20:20,23 WordPerfect (1) 4:4 words (3) 12:4;15:6,23 work (4) 11:7;12:12;18:10; 25:8 worked (1) 11:13 working (2) 11:14;16:6 works (1) 25:14 world (1) 26:24 worst (1) 26:23 worth (2) 20:12;22:1 write (2) 9:11;26:21	19:1 young (1) 9:18 1 10 (2) 25:2,15 10:36 (1) 27:13 117 (1) 14:10 11992 (1) 14:3 12 (1) 23:25 120 (1) 14:11 12th (5) 24:2;25:2,9,15,20 15th (1) 16:9 165,000 (1) 6:7 182,000 (1) 13:16 2 200 (1) 13:25 2016 (1) 4:13 2022 (1) 3:1 20th (1) 16:7 240,00 (1) 24:9 26 (1) 23:21 29 (1) 3:1 3 39 (1) 5:12 39,000 (2) 5:12;10:20 3rd (1) 16:23 Y 7	16:25;17:4 8 80-page (1) 14:7 86,000 (3) 5:12,25;10:20 86,400-dollar (1) 5:6 9 94 (1) 9:19	
year (1) 20:13 years (2) 4:5,8 years' (1) 20:12 yesterday (4) 12:12;16:15;17:6;	76018 (4) 6:6;11:2;16:25; 23:7 77 (1) 14:3 77335 (2) 5:2;23:7 78381 (2)		